On the Harmonization of Channel Access Policies for High Priority EDCA: **Balancing the Tail Time Latency of STAs during High-Priority EDCA Periods**

Date: March 4, 2025

Authors:

| Name	Affiliations	Address	Phone	email
Behnam Dezfouli	Nokia	520 Almanor, Sunnyvale, CA		behnam.dezfouli@nokia.com
Davis Robertson				
Klaus Doppler				
Salvatore Talarico				
Kerstin Johnsson				
Mikhail Liubogoshchev				
Prabodh Varshney				

Introduction

- Lowering the tail-time latency of STAs competing for channel access through EDCA has been addressed in several contributions [11-24/1918][11-24/1144][11-24/0864]

- High-Priority (HiP) EDCA mechanism [11-24/1918][11-24/1144]
  - Allows STAs with LL traffic to send Defer Signal (DS) frame after a certain number of retries
  - These STAs can compete for channel access AIFS[AC] after the end of the DS frame
  - STAs that receive at least the preamble of a DS frame will refrain from contention for EIFS
  - STAs that receive the DS frame will refrain from contention for NAV

- In this contribution, **we focus on the unfairness problem caused by the difference in the received signal quality (strength) from non-AP STAs at the AP and propose solutions to balance the tail time latency of these STAs**
- **We propose methods where STAs switch to sending a DS frame based on factors such as the signal quality received at the AP**

Overview of the HiP EDCA

[11-24/1918][11-24/1144]

- STA$_1$, STA$_2$, STA$_4$ and STA$_5$ have LL (AC_VO) traffic to send to the AP (STA$_3$)

- All these STAs have experienced a certain number of failures (e.g., one or more)

- **All STAs are eligible to send DS frame**

- STA$_1$ and STA$_2$ select earlier timeslot (#3) and send DS frames

- We assume STA$_4$ receives the preamble of DS$_2$ frame sent by STA$_2$: **Sets EIFS**
  - 94 microsecond assuming non-HT PHY parameters

- We assume STA$_5$ receives the entire DS$_2$ frame sent by STA$_2$: **Sets NAV**

- **In the contention round starting at t_4, only STA$_1$ and STA$_2$ compete**
  - **STA$_1$ wins the channel**

# The Unfairness Problem and Tail Time Latency

- **When a STA_X competes with STAs whose received signal quality at the AP is higher, STA_X keeps losing the channel contention to those STAs**
  - This occurs due to the capture effect, which results in receiving a frame from the STA with higher signal quality, even in the presence of interference from other STAs
  - For example, the greater the number of STAs that are closer to the AP than STA_X, the higher the probability that STA_X will lose the contention

- The numerical values represent the RSSI received by the AP from each STA
- **STA_4, STA_5, and STA_6 are at a disadvantage when competing with STA_1, STA_2, and STA_3**

❑ **The Unfairness Problem**

- STA$_1$, STA$_2$ and STA$_4$ need to send AC_VO traffic to STA$_3$ (the AP)

- **STA$_1$ and STA$_2$ are located 2 meters from STA$_3$ (AP), while STA$_4$ is 15 meters away from the AP**

- **First contention round:** STA$_2$ and STA$_4$ both select timeslot #1 and transmit RTS frames simultaneously at time t_1
  - Since STA$_2$ is closer to the AP, the AP successfully receives the RTS frame sent by STA$_2$ (i.e., RTS$_2$)

- **Second contention round B:** STA$_1$ and STA$_4$ select timeslot #0 and transmit RTS frames simultaneously
  - The AP successfully receives the RTS frame sent by STA$_1$ because it is closer than STA$_4$

- Note: The first and second contention rounds may not be consecutive

Observing the Unfairness Problem through Simulation

- Simulation parameters: 1 BSS, 30 x 30 m², 40 STAs uniformly distributed, STAs sending AC_VO traffic at the same rate

TXOP reservation success rate versus distance
- A TXOP reservation is successfully reserved when the RTS sent by the STA is received and acknowledged by the AP
- If no response (CTS) is received, the STA needs to compete for channel access again

- **Observation: The TXOP reservation success rate decreases as the signal quality received at the AP deteriorates**

❑ **Observing the Unfairness Problem through Simulation**

Latency
- Measured as the time between the arrival of a frame in the MAC layer of a non-AP STA until successful delivery to the AP

- **Observation: Latency increases as the signal quality received at the AP deteriorates**

Switching between Response-Soliciting and Non-Response-Soliciting Frames

- In this contribution, we strive to provide the STAs with a signal-quality-aware channel access probability and balance the tail time latency of all STAs

- We propose that, during EDCA periods, **STAs switch from sending response-soliciting frames (e.g., RTS, data frames) to non-response-soliciting frames (e.g., CTS-to-self) based on different metrics**
  - e.g., **Received RSSI from/by AP**

- **Justification: A STA sending a non-response-soliciting frame can compete for channel access before the STAs sending response-soliciting frames**
  - A STA sending a non-response-soliciting frame may compete for channel access after **AIFS[AC]** after the end of the frame
  - In contrast, a STA sending a response-soliciting frame must wait for **ACK Timeout + AIFS[AC]** before competing for channel access

❑ **Proposed Solution**

- STA$_5$, which is located 15 meters from the AP, is competing with STA$_1$, STA$_2$ and STA$_3$, which are located 2 meters from the AP

- **First contention:** STA$_1$ loses the first contention round to STA$_3$

- **Second contention:** No STA succeeds

- **Third contention:** STA$_1$ switches to sending DS frame (CTS-to-self), while STA$_1$ and STA$_2$ use RTS

- **The fourth contention round of STA$_5$ is earlier than that of STA$_1$ and STA$_2$**
  - STA$_5$ wins the channel and reserves a TXOP successfully

Switching Criteria

- The criteria for switching between sending response-soliciting and non-response-soliciting frames can be determined in various ways

- **Sample method**
  - The AP announces the range of RSSI values that are eligible for sending non-response-soliciting frames
  - In addition, the AP may announce probabilities or priorities for each RSSI range

Eligible RSSI	#retries	Switching probability	Eligible RSSI	#retries	Switching probability
-60 to -69	2	0.4	-70 to -79	2	0.6

The AP allows STAs with RSSI between -60 to -69 dBm to switch to sending non-response-soliciting frames for 40% of contentions rounds after experiencing 2 retries

The AP allows STAs with RSSI between -70 to -70 dBm to switch to sending non-response-soliciting frames for 60% of contentions rounds after experiencing 2 retries

❑ **Switching Criteria**

- **Sample method**
  - The AP announces the RSSI distribution of STAs
  - Based on this information, non-AP STAs decide about the criteria, such as the number of failed transmissions (i.e., channel access retries), before switching to non-response-soliciting frames

RSSI	#STAs	RSSI	#STAs	RSSI	#STAs
-50 to -59	4	-60 to -69	3	-70 to -79	2

Summary

- **When STAs whose received signal quality at the AP is different, the STAs with higher signal quality have a higher chance of capturing the channel and succeeding during EDCA periods**
  - This results in longer tail time latency of STAs whose signal quality at the AP is lower

- **To balance the tail time of STAs, in this contribution, we proposed to use different criteria for switching between response-soliciting and non-response-soliciting frames**
- For example, STAs that are further from the AP or located behind obstacles may switch to sending a Defer Signal (DS) frame after two failures, whereas STAs closer to the AP may switch to sending a Defer Signal (DS) frame after three failures

Straw Poll

- Do you agree that the signal quality (e.g., RSSI) between the AP and non-AP STAs should be considered when determining the switching criteria between response-soliciting (e.g., RTS) and non-response-soliciting (e.g., Defer Signal/CTS-to-Self) frames during high-priority EDCA periods?

YES/NO/ABSTAIN